

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, and 12 have been amended and new claims 17-24 have been added. No new matter is introduced by the new claims. The new claims are supported by Figure 6 and on page 17, line 24 through page 19, line 21, among other places. Accordingly, claims 1-24 remain pending.

The Examiner has objected to claim 1 and claim 1 has been amended accordingly.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-7 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Arunachalam (U.S. patent publication no. 2003/0069922). The Examiner has also rejected claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arunachalam in view of Hawblitzel et al. (Implementing Multiple Domains in Java, pages 1-15). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed as follows.

Claim 1 is directed towards a method "for executing a remote method." Claim 1 also requires "determining whether each argument of a remote method is a remote object" and "wrapping each argument of the remote method when each argument is determined to be a remote object." Claim 1 also requires "copying each argument of the remote method when each argument is determined not a to be remote object." In other words, each argument is wrapped when it is determined that each argument is a remote object. Otherwise, each argument is copied when it is determined that each argument is not a remote object. Claims 1 also requires "invoking the remote method using each wrapped or copied argument" and determining whether a result of the invoked remote method is a remote object" and "wrapping the result of the invoked remote method when the result is determined to be a remote object." Claim 1 also recites "copying the result of the remote method when the result is determined not to be a remote object." That is, each result is wrapped when it is determined whether the result is a remote object. Otherwise, the result is simply copied. Independent claims 9 and 17 have similar limitations regarding the handling of remote arguments and results.


Although the cited reference Arunachalam discloses general mechanisms for copying arguments, as well as referencing arguments, Arunachalam fails to teach or suggest wrapping an argument when it is determined that it is a remote object and, otherwise, copying such argument when it is determined that the argument is not a remote object, in the manner claimed. That is, the reference Arunachalam fails to teach or suggest a mechanism for determining whether an object is a remote object and that wrapping an argument is dependent upon such determination, in the manner claimed. Likewise, Arunachalam fails to teach that copying an argument is dependent upon a determination as to whether the argument is not a remote object, in the manner claimed. Accordingly, since Arunachalam fails to teach that the wrapping of an object is

dependent on whether it is determined that the object is a remote object and that copying an object is dependent on whether it is determined that the object is not a remote object, in the manner claimed, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable over the cited art.

The Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims are also respectfully traversed. However, to expedite prosecution, all of these claims will not be argued separately. Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 each depend directly from independent claims 1, 9, and 17 and, therefore, are respectfully submitted to be patentable over cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17. Further, the dependent claims require additional elements that when considered in context of the claimed inventions further patentably distinguish the invention from the cited art.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Mary Olynick  
Reg. 42,963

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
(510) 843-6200